

Children's Long Term Support Waivers
Options for Exceptions to Three Year Limit on
Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services

▪ **Option 1: Existing Exceptions Policy**

An extension beyond three years of service for Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services under the Children's Long Term Support Waivers (CLTS) may be granted in some exceptional circumstances. This policy has been created so that the clinical effectiveness of Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services can be ensured without detrimental interruptions of service in appropriate circumstances.

To have an extension granted, all of the following criteria must be met:

1. There must have been a significant lapse in Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services of at least 90 days.
2. There must be a clinical justification from the child's lead therapist to support the requested extension.
3. There must have been six months of service delivered to the child continuously at some point within the child's original three-year timeframe.

An extension will be granted to each child only one time. The length of the extension depends upon individual circumstances and the amount of time involved in the lapse of services.

Option 1 PRO	Option 1 CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Assures that three years of service are delivered due to an unavoidable gap in service.▪ Assures that services are not fragmented over a long period of time, which reduces effectiveness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Lapse time of 90 days may seem overly long before an exception would be considered.▪ The one-time only policy may unnecessarily limit families with circumstances, which warrant an additional exception.

▪ **Option 2: More permissive timelines based on Existing Draft Policy.**

Change criteria in the exceptions policy above to permit shorter lapses to be cause for an extension of time as follows:

To have an extension granted, the following criteria must be met:

1. There must have been a significant lapse in Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services of at least 30 days.
2. There must be a clinical justification from a provider who meets CLTS Waiver standards.
3. There must have been two months of service delivered to the child continuously at some point within the child's original 3-year timeframe.

This extension would be granted one time.

Option 2 PRO	Option 2 CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assure that three years of service are delivered due to routine gaps in service (change of provider, moving, etc.) Exception criteria allows for more variability in circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs will increase, as more exceptions would be granted than under original criteria. The one-time only limit may unnecessarily limit families with circumstances, which warrant an additional exception.

▪ **Option 3: Extend until Kindergarten**

The child's intensive in-home autism treatment services, for those children starting treatment before age five, would be extended until the child is first eligible to enter Kindergarten. Children are eligible to begin Kindergarten as long as they are five years old prior to September 1st. There must also be a clinical justification to indicate that this is necessary for the child to continue to make progress or to make an appropriate transition to school services.

Option 3 PRO	Option 3 CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be continuity of services for young children before school services were available. Early childhood is an important window in which a child may make significant gains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs will increase as more families would have children eligible to receive services longer than three years. Children are eligible for early childhood special education services and this may shift costs from public education to the human service system.

▪ **Option 4: Ensure a total of 156 weeks of service, disregarding any lapses, based on clinical justification.**

A child would be considered for an exception to the three year frame for intensive services if he or she has not yet received the cumulative total of weeks of 156 (three years) of intensive in-home autism treatment services. This would be permitted up until the child's 11th birthday. There must be a clinical justification that the child is making progress toward treatment goals and that the extension of service will continue to provide benefit to the child.

Option 4 PRO	Option 4 CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A child would be able to utilize three years of intensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuity of care could be compromised.

Option 4 PRO	Option 4 CON
<p>in-home autism service under the CLTS Waivers with multiple extensions as long as clinical progress is made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A child would have a larger window of time in which to complete services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness of intensive in-home autism treatment services may be reduced if the child starts and stops treatment multiple times.

▪ **Option 5: Individually Considered Exceptions**

Any family wishing to extend their Intensive In-Home Autism Treatment Services beyond the original three-year limit may apply to the Bureau of Long Term Support or a Professional Review Panel for individual consideration. Families are encouraged to work with their provider agency to document the need for the extension. Clinical criteria could include a child with complex medical needs that periodically interfere with intensive autism treatment services, a child who has just begun to make significantly greater progress than previously noted, a child who lost skills due to significant or traumatic event, or an extension of services would meet a specific and short term goal that would substantially affect the future well-being of the child. Specific exceptions criteria would need to be defined.

Option 5 PRO	Option 5 CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unique child and family situations would be individually addressed. ▪ Bureau staff could use a wide variety of information to make an appropriate decision. ▪ Clinical criteria would guide the decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs will increase as more exceptions would be granted than under original criteria. ▪ Agreement on standard criteria for exceptions may be challenging to establish. ▪ The Review Committee composition would need to have significant expertise to decipher complex functional cases. ▪ There would be costs involved in reimbursement for the review panel.